

brought alive from the island, and in whose care it lived for about four years in China.

The animal seems most closely to resemble *H. hoolock*, but differs from that, as from every other known species (except *H. syndactylus*), by the entire absence of the white superciliary streak, the animal being absolutely jet-black everywhere.

With the exception of the Siamang all the so-called species of *Hyllobates* are so closely allied to each other and differ by characters of such slight importance that they seem to be really hardly worthy of specific distinction. Still for the present it seems better provisionally to recognize them as such, and unless they are all united it will be necessary to consider the Hainan form also as distinct, its differential characters being of very much the same value as in the cases of the other "species." I would therefore propose for it the name of *Hyllobates hainanus*. At the same time I confess that I shall not be surprised to see this form reduced later to the rank of a subspecies.

Two species have, however, also been described as without the superciliary streak, namely *H. fuscus* * and *H. concolor* †. The former of these is distinguished from *H. hainanus* by its brown colour, apart from all question of locality, while the latter, based on a young specimen, and that an hermaphrodite, was a native of Borneo, and in all probability was the same as *H. Muelleri* ‡. Its youth and abnormality, however, render it impossible for this point to be settled with certainty, and in any case it can have nothing to do with the Hainan species.

H. hainanus appears to be of about the same size as *H. hoolock*, but the type, although nearly, is not quite adult. Its humerus measures 210 millim. in length, its ulna 250, and its femur 185.

XXIV.—*Diagnosis of a new Subspecies of Hare from the Corea.* By OLDFIELD THOMAS.

Lepus sinensis coreanus, subsp. n.

Size slightly larger and heavier than in the typical form.

Colour greyer throughout, the rufous tips to the hairs, especially on the rump and tail, being replaced by pale greyish fawn.

* Lewis, Bost. Journ. N. H. i. pt. 1, p. 32 (1834).

† Harlan, J. Ac. Philad. v. p. 229 (1827).

‡ See Anderson, Zool. Yumm. Exp., Mamm. p. 11 (1879).

Skull stouter and heavier. Nasals of more equal breadth throughout, not so markedly compressed and pointed anteriorly, nor so much bowed in profile. Frontal region broader, and the postorbital processes projecting much further out from the skull.

Dimensions.—Head and body (from skin) (c.) 450 millim., tail, with tuft, (c.) 60, ear from crown behind 83, hind foot 107.

Skull: greatest length, from occiput to gnathion, 83; nasals, greatest length 35, combined breadth anteriorly 15 (against 11·5 in a good Shanghai specimen of *L. s. typicus*), posteriorly 18·8 (against 19·2); least interorbital breadth 21 (against 18); least intertemporal breadth 12·2 (against 12·2); distance from the bottom of the postorbital notch to a point on the outer edge of the postorbital process level with it transversely 8 (against 5·4). Palate, length 34. Diastema 22. Breadth of palatal bridge 7. Antero-posterior diameter of bulla 10·5 (against 11·8).

Hab. Söul, the capital of Corea.

Type a skin obtained on Jan. 28, 1889, and presented to the Museum by Mr. Charles W. Campbell, of Her Majesty's Consular Service.

As the Museum at present possesses only summer skins of *L. sinensis typicus*, it is possible that the above differences in colour will prove to be only a seasonal character; but the skull differences are so marked and so constant in a series of S. Chinese skulls that I do not feel justified in allocating the Corean hare to the older-known form.

Should, however, the colour differences prove to be constant throughout the year it is possible that it will be found necessary to elevate *L. sinensis coreanus* to the rank of a distinct species.

XXV.—*Description of a new Species of Meriones from Palestine.* By OLDFIELD THOMAS.

THE Gerbille now described belongs to the group known as *Meriones*, a group which, in agreement with Brandt and Lataste, and differing from F. Cuvier, Blanford, and Büchner, I consider differs so essentially from *Gerbillus* as to merit its retention as a distinct genus.

I propose, in honour of its discoverer, to name the species